EXHIBIT 4

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 2 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA 3 RICHMOND DIVISION 4 STEVES AND SONS, INC., : Civil Action No. 5 3:16cv545 6 VS. : January 29, 2018 7 JELD-WEN, INC. 8 9 10 COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL PROCEEDINGS 11 BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT E. PAYNE 12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 13 APPEARANCES: 14 Lewis F. Powell, III, Esquire John S. Martin, Esquire Maya M. Eckstein, Esquire 15 Hunton & Williams Riverfront Plaza, East Tower 16 951 East Byrd Street 17 Richmond, Virginia 23219 Glenn Pomerantz, Esquire 18 Ted Dane, Esquire 19 Munger Tolles & Olson, LLP 355 South Grand Avenue 20 35th Floor VOLUME II Los Angeles, California 90071 21 22 23 24 25

```
APPEARANCES: (cont'q)
 1
 2
    Kyle Mach, Esquire
    Munger Tolles & Olson, LLP
 3
    560 Mission Street
    27th Floor
 4
    San Francisco, California 94105
    Counsel for the plaintiff
 5
    Margaret M. Zwisler, Esquire
 6
    Allyson M. Maltas, Esquire
    Latham & Watkins, LLP
 7
    555 11th Street NW
    Suite 1000
 8
    Washington, D.C. 20004
 9
    Alfred C. Pfeiffer, Esquire
    Latham & Watkins, LLP
10
    505 Montgomery Street
    Suite 2000
11
    San Francisco, California 94111
12
    Lawrence E. Buterman, Esquire
    Latham & Watkins, LLP
13
    885 Third Avenue
    25th Floor
    New York, New York 10022
14
    Michael W. Smith, Esquire
15
    Craig T. Merritt, Esquire
16
    Christian & Barton
    909 East Main Street
17
    Suite 1200
    Richmond, Virginia 23219
    Counsel for the defendant
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

11:57:54AM 2 11:57:57AM 3 11:58:02AM 4 11:58:07AM 5 11:58:12AM 6 11:58:17AM 7 11:58:20AM 8 11:58:26AM 9 11:58:29AM 10 11:58:38AM 11 11:58:44AM 11:58:48AM 12 13 11:58:52AM 14 11:58:56AM 15 11:59:02AM 16 11:59:04AM 17 11:59:07AM 18 11:59:12AM 19 11:59:17AM 20 11:59:22AM

21

22

23

24

25

11:59:24AM

11:59:26AM

11:59:31AM

11:59:36AM

11:59:40AM

So whether the economy is good or whether the economy is bad, these are still the two questions to keep your eye on:

Does Jeld-Wen's acquisition of CMI substantially lessen competition, or does it tend to create a monopoly.

They also tell you that Steves has options for buying door skins. They may tell you that Jeld-Wen itself is willing to enter into a new supply agreement with Steves, and if Jeld-Wen does say that to you during the course of this trial, remember this document by Hachigian, and remember this one.

And Jeld-Wen may say to you that Masonite is still an option for Steves even though Masonite has made these public announcements that it's not going to sell. And if they say that to you, I want you to remember the testimony that you're going to hear from the CEO of Masonite, Fred Lynch.

We took his deposition, and that's another deposition that's going to be played, and you're going to see his testimony. And what Mr. Lynch is going to say under oath is this: He's going to say under oath that we're not interested in a long-term agreement with Steves. Under oath, that's his position. We're still not interested in a long-term agreement with Steves.

And then he's also going to say to you that if any third-party were to ask us to sell them door skins, they submitted a purchase order, we might fill it, we might not depending on our capacity. Well, Edward and Sam are going to

11:59:45AM

11:59:48AM

11:59:51AM

11:59:55AM

12:00:01PM

12:00:05PM

12:00:09PM

12:00:13PM

12:00:15PM

12:00:18PM

12:00:23PM

12:00:25PM

12:00:28PM

12:00:31PM

12:00:35PM

12:00:40PM

12:00:44PM

12:00:49PM

12:00:52PM

12:00:53PM

12:00:57PM

12:01:01PM

12:01:04PM

12:01:07PM

12:01:11PM

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

tell you that they need a reliable source of door skins in order to stay in business. They need someone who will sell them door skins so that they can make doors and sell them to Home Depot and the homebuilders. They need a reliable source.

And Jeld-Wen may tell you there's another option for Sam and Edward to go get door skins. They're going to say, you can go get door skins from companies that make door skins who are outside the United States, and there are companies that are outside the United States that make door skins. They're in Turkey, and they're in Romania, and Edward and Sam have looked into that option.

They had to look into that option because Jeld-Wen said they were terminating the long-term supply agreement, and they spent a lot of time looking at it. Ultimately, they concluded the option was not viable, and here are a couple of things that Edward and Sam learned. Remember I told you that they make 477 different styles and sizes of door skins? And the reason why they make so many is because that's what their customers want.

Home Depot wants to offer homeowners a wide array of doors so that they can choose what they want. Choice. It's a case about choice. And the same thing with the homebuilders. They have different styles of homes and different things that different homeowners want, so they want a wide range of doors to put in homes.

12:01:12PM 2 12:01:19PM 3 12:01:23PM 4 12:01:27PM 12:01:31PM 5 6 12:01:37PM 7 12:01:42PM 8 12:01:44PM 9 12:01:50PM 10 12:01:54PM 11 12:01:57PM 12:02:03PM 12 13 12:02:06PM 14 12:02:10PM 15 12:02:15PM 16 12:02:21PM 17 12:02:27PM 18 12:02:30PM 19 12:02:36PM 20 12:02:40PM 21 12:02:44PM 12:02:46PM 22 23 12:02:49PM 24 12:02:54PM

25

12:02:58PM

So Steves sells 477 different styles and sizes.

Well, after Edward and Sam traveled around the world a couple times, they found out that if you looked at all of the door skin suppliers that were outside the United States, they could only make 20 different styles and sizes of door skins. Only 20 were available altogether, just 20. That's not a viable option for Steves.

And there was another problem: Quality. Many of the door skins that Edward and Sam tested that came from these suppliers outside the United States, and you'll hear names like Teverpan and Yildiz and Kastamonu, when they tested those door skins, sometimes they were okay, and sometimes they failed.

You see, here in the United States, homeowners expect high quality doors, and, therefore, you need high quality door skins. And Steves needs to be able to provide high quality doors all the time. Not some of the time, all of the time.

And Jeld-Wen may tell you that Steves has one more option. They may say, Steves can just go build its own door skin plant. Jeld-Wen has door skins plants, Masonite has door skin plants, Steves can build its own door skin plant.

Well, Edward and Sam also looked at that option.

They did. They looked at it, and when they looked at that option, they spent a lot of time, and then they figured out what Jeld-Wen already knew, and you know that Jeld-Wen already knew it because it's in their documents.

12:03:01PM 2 12:03:04PM 3 12:03:08PM 4 12:03:12PM 12:03:16PM 5 6 12:03:21PM 7 12:03:27PM 8 12:03:27PM 9 12:03:30PM 10 12:03:34PM 12:03:38PM 11 12:03:41PM 12 13 12:03:45PM 14 12:03:49PM 15 12:03:51PM 16 12:03:55PM 17 12:03:59PM 18 12:04:05PM 19 12:04:09PM 20 12:04:13PM 21 12:04:18PM 12:04:25PM 22

23

24

25

12:04:28PM

12:04:33PM

12:04:38PM

This is another document that came from inside

Jeld-Wen, and it has in the upper right-hand corner barriers to
entry, and what that refers to are things that would stop
anyone from building a door skin plant, barriers to entry, and
you see the very first bullet on the page. It's going to cost
over \$100 million to build a door skin plant, over
\$100 million.

Well, Steves doesn't have a hundred million dollars to build a door skin plant, and so far no one has raised their hand and said, we'll partner with you and we'll pay that amount. That has not happened. Then you'll see six other bullets listing six other barriers to entry; die infrastructure, technically challenging equipment, steep learning curve.

Those are all barriers to entry, and there's another barrier to entry that's not on this page: Patents. Patents.

You see, Jeld-Wen and Masonite claim to own a lot of patents relating to door skins, relating to the processes for manufacturing door skins and for the designs of door skins, and Steves can't use any process or design that's subject to a valid patent of Jeld-Wen or Masonite unless Jeld-Wen or Masonite give them permission to do so.

This is an email that Hachigian sent on July 8th, 2015, to Onex. Ross and Munk work for Onex. You see in the subject line it says, "EGS letter to KH." EGS is Edward G.

Steves. KH is Kirk Hachigian. And you see, Edward sent a letter to Kirk Hachigian in July of 2015. He was being upfront. He said, hey, we're going to look into building our own door skin plant. You said you're going to terminate the supply agreement, we're going to look into that option.

And Hachigian writes to Onex, "We will protect our IP, of course." IP. Intellectual property. That's what that stands for. Patents are intellectual property. What Hachigian is saying to Onex after Edward told him they're going to look into building a door skin plant is, we're going to protect our IP. We're going to protect our patents.

One more document about building a door skin plant. Hachigian says in May of 2014 to Onex, "I'm seriously considering terminating all the agreements." That's the supply agreements with Steves and the other small door manufacturers. So in five years, they all need to lay out \$100 million in capital. That's how much it costs to build a door skin plant, and Ross writes back, Onex writes back, "Assuming your logic that none of the independents will ever build a skin plant from scratch, we can talk through the logic of why I think that's a good assumption." Remember this email when someone from Jeld-Wen comes in and takes the stand and says that Steves can build its own door skin plant.

One other thing you might hear from Jeld-Wen during the course of this trial, they may point you to the second

12:04:46PM 2 12:04:49PM 3 12:04:54PM 4 12:04:57PM 12:05:00PM 5 6 12:05:03PM 7 12:05:08PM 8 12:05:13PM 9 12:05:17PM 10 12:05:22PM 11 12:05:23PM 12:05:28PM 12 13 12:05:35PM 14 12:05:40PM 15 12:05:44PM 16 12:05:46PM 17 12:05:50PM 18 12:05:54PM 12:05:59PM 19 20 12:06:04PM 21 12:06:07PM

12:06:13PM

12:06:16PM

12:06:21PM

12:06:24PM

22

23

24

25

12:06:27PM

12:06:31PM

12:06:35PM

12:06:38PM

12:06:43PM

12:06:46PM

12:06:50PM

12:06:55PM

12:06:59PM

12:07:04PM

12:07:10PM

12:07:14PM

12:07:19PM

12:07:25PM

12:07:28PM

12:07:32PM

12:07:38PM

12:07:41PM

12:07:44PM

12:07:47PM

12:07:51PM

12:07:54PM

12:07:58PM

12:08:02PM

12:08:05PM

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sentence of the termination provision of the supply agreement, and that provision says that Jeld-Wen may terminate this agreement for any reason, or no reason at all, upon seven years' written notice to Steves with no liability. Jeld-Wen may say that's all they did.

In September of 2014, they sent a notice and gave Steves seven years' notice. Jeld-Wen comes in here and says that's all they did, look at the second sentence. What the second sentence says is that if Jeld-Wen gives notice, Steves can terminate immediately. Steves would be free, right now, to go enter into a deal with someone else, but in order to enter into a deal with someone else, there has to be someone else, and Jeld-Wen has acquired CMI. And Masonite has said it's not going to sell to the small door manufacturers.

Does Jeld-Wen's acquisition of CMI substantially lessen competition, or does it tend to create a monopoly?

Now, when I sit down, Jeld-Wen's lawyers can have a chance to come up here and talk to you, and she's going to tell you what this case is about from Jeld-Wen's perspective, and she may say some things that I have not addressed, and I don't get a chance to come up and talk to you again until the very end of the trial, and that's called closing argument.

So after she sits down, we start putting on our witnesses, and you start looking at exhibits and hearing from the witnesses. So I ask you to keep your mind open. I

promise, I commit to you that Mr. Powell and I will come back 12:08:08PM to you at the end of this trial, and we will respond to 2 12:08:12PM everything that they say during the trial. 3 12:08:14PM If Steves fails, if Steves goes out of business 4 12:08:20PM 5 because someone figures out how to build --12:08:30PM MS. ZWISLER: Your Honor, may I approach? 12:08:34PM MR. POMERANTZ: I'm sorry, I'll take that back. 7 12:08:36PM 8 MS. ZWISLER: May I approach, Your Honor? 12:08:36PM 9 12:08:36PM 10 (Discussion at sidebar as follows:) 12:08:36PM 12:08:45PM 11 MS. ZWISLER: He just said if Steves goes out of 12:08:45PM 12 13 business, and he was about to say --12:08:48PM 14 THE COURT: You're going to retract that, aren't you? 12:08:50PM 15 MR. POMERANTZ: I will. 12:08:52PM 16 THE COURT: Okay. 12:08:54PM 17 12:08:54PM 18 (End of sidebar discussion.) 12:08:54PM 19 12:08:56PM 20 THE COURT: You are quicker than I was, Ms. Zwisler. 12:08:56PM MR. POMERANTZ: I'm going to start that one over 21 12:09:01PM 12:09:03PM 22 again, and I retract what I just said. 23 THE COURT: Just disregard what he said about going 12:09:05PM 24 out of business. 12:09:08PM MR. POMERANTZ: Please. If someone figures out how 25 12:09:09PM

```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
 2
              FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
 3
                        RICHMOND DIVISION
 4
    STEVES AND SONS, INC., : Civil Action No.
 5
                                      3:16cv545
 6
    VS.
                                  : February 14, 2018
 7
    JELD-WEN, INC.
 8
 9
10
            COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL PROCEEDINGS
11
               BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT E. PAYNE
12
                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
    APPEARANCES:
14
    Lewis F. Powell, III, Esquire
    John S. Martin, Esquire
    Maya M. Eckstein, Esquire
15
    Hunton & Williams
    Riverfront Plaza, East Tower
16
    951 East Byrd Street
17
    Richmond, Virginia 23219
    Glenn Pomerantz, Esquire
18
    Ted Dane, Esquire
19
    Munger Tolles & Olson, LLP
    355 South Grand Avenue
    35th Floor
20
                                            VOLUME XII
    Los Angeles, California 90071
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
    APPEARANCES: (cont'q)
 2
    Kyle Mach, Esquire
    Munger Tolles & Olson, LLP
 3
    560 Mission Street
    27th Floor
 4
    San Francisco, California 94105
    Counsel for the plaintiff
 5
    Margaret M. Zwisler, Esquire
 6
    Allyson M. Maltas, Esquire
    Latham & Watkins, LLP
 7
    555 11th Street NW
    Suite 1000
 8
    Washington, D.C. 20004
 9
    Alfred C. Pfeiffer, Esquire
    Latham & Watkins, LLP
    505 Montgomery Street
10
    Suite 2000
11
    San Francisco, California 94111
12
    Lawrence E. Buterman, Esquire
    Latham & Watkins, LLP
13
    885 Third Avenue
    25th Floor
    New York, New York 10022
14
    Michael W. Smith, Esquire
15
    Craig T. Merritt, Esquire
16
    Christian & Barton
    909 East Main Street
17
    Suite 1200
    Richmond, Virginia 23219
    Counsel for the defendant
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

11:51:59 1 And then you have to fill in the damages that were sustained because of the reduction in competition, because 11:52:01 2 11:52:03 3 of the lack of choice. And the first one is -- and this 11:52:06 4 is antitrust injuries already sustained as a result of the 11:52:10 5 conduct. And this is Jeld-Wen's overcharging Steves for 11:52:13 6 door skins other than Madison/Monroe. So that's basically 11:52:17 7 the paragraph 6 price adjustment that they should have 11:52:20 8 gone down instead of saying that they could only go up. 11:52:24 9 That's \$8,630,567. 11:52:3110 11:52:3611 11:52:45 12

11:52:5013

11:52:5414

11:52:58 15

11:52:58 16

11:52:5917

11:53:0718

11:53:0919

11:53:10 20

11:53:12 21

11:53:15 22

11:53:20 23

11:53:23 24

11:53:2625

As to the second one, "Jeld-Wen's overcharging for Madison/Monroe, \$1,303,035. For the defective door skins, \$441,458. And for refusing to reimburse Steves for doors, \$1,776,813.

And then as to Count One, we, the jury, find, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the plaintiff is entitled to damages in the amount of \$46,480,581 for future lost profits. That's what we ask you here. We think it's fully supported by the evidence. That's the antitrust claim.

Then you're going to go to the contract claim. And we would ask you to find yes as to each of the breaches that we allege. The first one is Madison/Monroe -- I'm sorry. The first one is the overcharges for Section 6 other than Madison and Monroe. There you say yes. And it's the same, 8,630,567. And, again, we're asking for it 11:53:33 1 twice here not because we want a double recovery. 11:53:36 2 judge will take care of that. We're asking that because 11:53:39 3 the same damage flows from the antitrust violation as from 11:53:41 4 the breach of contract. That's what we're asking you for. 11:53:44 5 It's the same damage. One is because we lost choice. Wе 11:53:47 6 lost competition. We would have gone someplace else. 11:53:51 7 That's the antitrust claim. And the contract is they just 11:53:54 8 breached it. They just said the prices could only go up 11:53:57 9 when the prices could go down. 11:53:58 10 The second one is Madison and Monroe, and that's for 11:54:0511 11:54:12 12 defective door skins where they didn't reimburse us, 11:54:15 13 441,458. Question 10 is talking about the cost of doors

11:54:20 14

11:54:23 15

11:54:28 16

11:54:3517

11:54:3918

11:54:42 19

11:54:47 20

11:54:50 21

11:54:54 22

11:54:58 23

11:55:04 24

11:55:08 25

1,303,035. That was also a breach. The third was for the that we got from customers and they wouldn't credit us. That's yes, and it's 1.776,813. That's what we ask you to do. We think it's fully supported by the evidence.

All right. About to wrap up. I've been spending the last long bit of time, two hours, talking to you about come competition and economics. And all of that is necessary because we're dealing with an antitrust claim. And it's based on economics and competition. But I'm worried that you just see this as an economic story. And it's not just an economic story. It's a human story.

Sam Steves has sat there every single minute of this trial. He has sat there because this trial means the

11:55:12 1 world to him. And I know that Edward wished he could have 11:55:16 2 sat there every day as well because he wanted to. But the 11:55:21 3 rules of the court only allow us to have one of them sit 11:55:24 4 here, and that's why Edward wasn't here. Now, you 11:55:27 5 remember on day one, Mark Beck, the CEO of Jeld-Wen came, 11:55:32 6 he came, and they said, Here's Mark Beck. But you've 11:55:36 7 never seen Mark Beck here again. He never came back to 11:55:39 8 this courtroom to participate in this trial, to listen and 11:55:42 9 to see, and that's because to Jeld-Wen, this is just 11:55:47 10 business. But to Steves, it's personal. 11:55:5311 This is about their family. This is about six 11:55:55 12 generations that preceded them and the generations to 11:55:5713 come. I'm sure you probably all remember when Sam came 11:56:0014 and took the stand a second time. It was when we had a 11:56:04 15 chance to ask Sam about Steves and Sons going out of 11:56:1116 business in 2021 because it wouldn't have door skins. 11:56:1417 he got kind of excited. He responded from the heart. 11:56:1718 responded emotionally. In fact, so emotionally that I

11:56:2019

11:56:2520

11:56:2821

11:56:31 22

11:56:3523

11:56:3924

11:56:44 25

Well, you know, if it was possible for Sam and Edward to go get the door skins from Teverpan, they'd do it in a heartbeat. Or build a plant. They'd do it in a heartbeat. But that's just not a likely option. So they need your help. You see, they can't do any more than they have done. They need you to send a message to Jeld-Wen.

think I recall Judge Payne saying, Settle down, big boy.

Не

That's your job. There is a right way and a wrong way for 11:56:49 1 11:56:54 2 companies to compete. A verdict in favor of Steves on the 11:56:59 3 antitrust claim and the contract claim will tell Jeld-Wen, 11:57:03 4 and other companies just like Jeld-Wen, that the people in 11:57:07 5 our community -- you, you represent the people in our 11:57:11 6 community -- we demand that you compete the right way. Wе 11:57:16 7 demand that. That's what the Clayton Act is for. 11:57:19 8 demand that Jeld-Wen compete the right way. Your verdict will send that message, and we encourage you to deliver 11:57:23 9 11:57:2610 the right verdict in this case. 11:57:28 11

Thank you. Thank you so much for listening to me today.

THE COURT: I think maybe you could stand a break? We'll take 20 minutes.

Please be seated while the jury is being excused. Twenty minutes.

(The jury exited the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Anything?

MS. SWISLER: If we're only taking a 20-minute break, we're going to have to interrupt my closing. And I think -- couldn't we take lunch now.

THE COURT: We don't have lunch. We don't have lunch for the jury now, I don't think. Do we have it?

THE CLERK: I'll check, Judge.

THE COURT: I don't think we have lunch. If I

11:58:07 18 11:58:13 19 11:58:16 20 11:58:19 21

11:57:3112

11:57:3313

11:57:3514

11:57:43 15

11:57:4616

11:57:47 17

11:58:2423

11:58:21 22

11:58:2924

11:58:30 25

```
11:58:34 1
            had lunch, I would consider it, but we don't. We didn't
11:58:37 2
            plan for this way.
11:58:39 3
                      MS. SWISLER: So couldn't they be excused to go
11:58:41 4
            out and have lunch?
11:58:42 5
                      THE COURT: We've already ordered their lunch.
11:58:45 6
                      MR. POWELL: Your Honor, the jury can have our
11:58:48 7
            lunch, if that would be --
11:58:50 8
                      MS. SWISLER: We have lunch, too. They can have
11:58:52 9
            that. I'd rather do that than have to stop. And I don't
11:58:5510
            think they'll pay attention to me if they don't eat.
11:58:58 11
            I may not get through it if I don't eat. So --
11:59:01 12
                      THE COURT: Okay. Give up your lunch.
11:59:0313
           hope -- do you have anything as good as Padows?
11:59:11 14
                      MS. SWISLER: I think --
11:59:12 15
                      MR. POWELL: I'm not vouching for the quality,
           Your Honor.
11:59:13 16
11:59:1517
                      THE COURT: If you're selling it -- if you're
11:59:17 18
            flogging it to the jury --
11:59:18 19
                      MR. POWELL: There's adequate quantity. I can
11:59:20 20
            promise you that.
11:59:20 21
                      THE COURT: You do have enough to give them?
11:59:21 22
                     MS. SWISLER: Yes, we do.
11:59:22 23
                      THE COURT: Do each of you want to contribute so
11:59:24 24
           that they'll be equal?
11:59:26 25
                     MR. POWELL: I think that's a good idea, Your
```